

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 3, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of the application, claims 17 and 18 are amended. Accordingly, claims 17-21 are pending in the application with claims 17 and 18 being in independent form. No new matter is introduced by way of this amendment. For the reasons provided below, the claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Summary of Telephonic Interview with Examiner Schell

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Schell for the December 18, 2007 telephonic interview. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to the claims to overcome the rejection of the claims over the prior art of record. Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078708) in view of Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138785 A1).

As amended, claim 17 is directed to a system for guiding a user through performance of a procedure corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply associated with the system. Specifically, the system comprises:

- at least one programmed processor embedded within or connected to the uninterruptible power supply;
- at least one sensor embedded within or connected to the uninterruptible power supply providing information regarding the status of the uninterruptible power supply, the programmed processor and the sensor being operatively coupled such that the programmed processor receives at least a portion of status information from the sensor;
- the programmed processor being configured to retrieve at least one stored procedure corresponding to the uninterruptible power supply including a plurality of steps to be performed by a user; and
- a display operatively coupled to the uninterruptible power supply for displaying the plurality of steps in order;

- the programmed processor being further configured to determine whether a currently displayed step has been properly performed based upon at least one of: (i) the information received from the sensor and (ii) one or more inputs entered by a user into the programmed processor, to determine whether a recovery from an error caused by a step which is not properly performed is possible, and, if recovery is possible, to provide one or more ***correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the correctional steps to the user on the display.***

Li et al. teach concepts associated with installing peripheral devices to a computer, such as a personal computer, and more particularly to informing the user of a discrete problem, i.e., an improper connection of a cable or the lack of a wireless connection. There is no teaching in Li et al. that the user is notified, after discovering an error, of “whether a ***recovery*** from [the] error caused by a step which is not properly performed is possible, and, ***if recovery is possible, to provide one or more correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the additional steps to the user on the display.***” As stated above, Li et al. inform the user of a failed connection. There is no teaching of providing one or more correctional steps to correct an error. This step is not obvious in light of Li et al., nor any of the other prior art of record.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Hammond et al. teach a system that performs power supply monitoring, and, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the modem installation guidance system of Li et al. with the ability to monitor the connectivity of an uninterruptible power supply (“UPS”) as taught by Hammond et al. in order to achieve Applicants’ recovery system as set forth in amended claim 17. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hammond et al. teach a UPS power supply critical monitoring system having a monitoring program that listens over a network for information transmitted from the UPS. For example, the information may indicate that the UPS is in a critical state, such as a low battery, an expired battery or a loss of UPS communication with the network. There is no suggestion in Hammond et al. to provide the user with an interactive recovery system for guiding the user through performance of a procedure. Hammond et al. are concerned about informing the user or the operator of a critical condition and recording the critical condition. *See* Hammond et al.,

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

paragraph no. [0012], for example. Hammond et al. do not teach recovery from the critical condition, much less Applicants' claimed programmed processor designed to enable the user or operator to **recover** from the critical condition by means of a guidance system as set forth in amended claim 17.

Claim 18 is directed to a method of guiding a user through performance of a procedure corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply, and is submitted as being patentable over the references of record for at least the same reasons given for claim 17. Specifically, claim 18 is directed to a method comprising:

- selecting a procedure from a list of one or more procedures corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply;
- performing a step of the procedure;
- determining whether the step of the procedure has been properly performed;
- determining whether a recovery step is available in the event the step of the procedure is not properly performed;
- *if a recovery step is available, displaying one or more correctional steps of the recovery step, at least one of which is different from the step of the procedure, to correct an error caused by a step of the procedure which is not properly performed;*
- *performing one or more correctional steps of the recovery step to correct an error caused by the step of the procedure which is not properly performed;* and
- displaying a next step of the procedure upon determining that the prior step has been properly performed.

Neither Li et al. nor Hammond et al. teach “selecting a procedure from a list of one or more procedures corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply” and “determining whether a recovery step is available in the event the step of the procedure is not properly performed.” As discussed above with reference to claim 17, Li et al. teach informing the user of a connection error. Li et al. further fail to disclose displaying one or more correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the step of the procedure. Hammond et al. teach monitoring certain aspects of a UPS and notifying the user of a critical state of the UPS. No recovery process is taught by Hammond et al.

Consequently, neither Li et al. nor Hammond et al. can teach “displaying one or more correctional steps of the recovery step, at least one of which is different from the step of the

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

procedure, to correct an error caused by a step of the procedure which is not properly performed,” “performing one or more correctional steps of the recovery step to correct an error caused by the step of the procedure which is not properly performed,” and displaying a next step of the procedure upon determining that the prior step has been properly performed” as set forth in amended claim 18. Since Li et al. and Hammond et al. fail to teach any recovery steps, they cannot teach a method having these requisite limitations.

Claims 19-21, which depend from claim 18, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons provided for claim 18.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the application is believed to be in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ Attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Keith F. Noe/
Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7039
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: January 3, 2008
Attorney Docket No.: A2000-708419

817464.1